

Office of Personnel Relations

Randy J. Ray Director of Personnel Relations

J. Ryan Hatch Nicholas Minderler Bryan Georgiady Labor Relations Specialists

> Jack Mekeel Safety Coordinator

Christine Barbagallo Kelly Walsh Administrative Assistants

Telephone: (315) 255-7683 or (315) 253-0361 FAX: (315) 255-7625 Email: <u>kwalsh@cayboces.org</u>

Providing comprehensive employment and personnel relations services to local school districts for over 45 years.

ADVOCATE

Cayuga-Onondaga BOCES Office of Personnel Relations 1879 West Genesee Street Road Auburn, New York 13021-9430

VOLUME XXXIX MAY -JUNE 2019

IN THIS ISSUE

- HIGH DEDUCTIBLE HEALTH INSURANCE - A PRIMER
- LONG-TERM SUSPENSION FOR SNAP CHAT POSTING UPHELD BY COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION
- LEGISLATURE MAY
 CHANGE CIVIL SERVICE
 EMPLOYEE DISCIPLINE
 PROCEDURES
- AREA TEACHER AND NON-INSTRUCTIONAL SETTLEMENTS
- AREA UNEMPLOYMENT RATES FOR APRIL 2019
- CPI FOR MAY 2019

CONGRATULATIONS!

The Cayuga-Onondaga BOCES Office of Personnel Relations **congratulates and** wishes a wonderful retirement to:

Dr. Suzanne McLeod Superintendent, Union-Endicott Central School District

and

Robert McKeveny Superintendent, Seneca Falls Central School District

The Office of Personnel Relations also welcomes and wishes much success to the newly appointed Chief School Officers:

Nicole Wolfe,

the recently appointed Superintendent at the Union-Endicott Central School District

David Bills,

the recently appointed Superintendent at the West Genesee Central School District

Jeramy Clingerman,

the recently appointed Superintendent at the Seneca Falls Central School District

and

Dr. Chris Brown,

the recently appointed Superintendent at the Marcus Whitman Central School District



High Deductible Health Insurance – A Primer

With negotiations in full swing, one of the most contentious issue discussed is health insurance. Currently, most districts offer some type of coinsurance health insurance plan. Both districts and employees are comfortable using indemnity or PPO plans because they are familiar. However, due to rising costs in insurance and salary, it may not always be in the best interest of the district or the employee to continue with their current plan. How can districts attempt to offset these rising costs? The conversation should happen with bargaining units about alternative types of health insurance coverage. One such alternative type of coverage, if available, is the High Deductible Health Plan ("HDHP"). There seems to be a stigma attached to these plans, but many of the perceived shortcomings can be easily addressed through education.

What is a HDHP? A HDHP is essentially a different way to pay for the same health insurance coverage. At its most basic, a HDHP means that participants pay for the full price of coverage up to a certain point, rather than paying co-pays at each visit. This means that the cost of the premiums are cheaper, which leads to savings for the district and the employee.

For the following explanation, we will assume the employee takes a high deductible *family plan*. We will also use the following qualifiers, as these are figures that many districts will ultimately use (note: these numbers are for illustration purposes only and could change depending on the plan offered):

 \$1,500 deductible for single coverage, with annual out-of-pocket maximum of \$3,000

- \$3,000 deductible for 2-person and family coverage, with annual out-of-pocket maximum of \$6,000
- 80/20 co-insurance with 5/35/70 Rx fees
- The above amounts reset every calendar year (January 1 - December 31).

How does a HDHP work? Simply, there are two phases to a HDHP. First, there is the deductible phase. In this phase, the employee on a family plan is responsible to pay 100% of all services and prescriptions up to \$3,000. For example, if a doctor visit is \$200, the employee would be responsible for the \$200. Once the employee has paid \$3,000 within a calendar year, the next phase involves the out-of-pocket maximum for the remainder of the year. At this point, the plan turns into a typical co-insurance plan. If the employee has a \$100 doctor bill, the employee would be responsible for \$20 (20%) and the plan will pay the remaining \$80 (80%). In this phase, the employee will also pay for prescriptions like a typical co-insurance plan (5/35/70) – all prescription costs also count toward the out-of-pocket maximum. If the employee accumulates costs of \$6,000 (both deductible and co-insurance payments) in a calendar year, the plan will pay 100% of all other services and prescriptions for the remainder of the calendar year. At no point will an employee pay more than \$6,000 (\$3,000 deductible + \$3,000 co-insurance) in the calendar year, even if the employee has very high medical bills (i.e. a \$50,000 bill would result in, at most, a payment of \$6,000 from the employee). All amounts will reset on January 1.

How do employees pay for the deductible and out-of-pocket maximum? The district can set up Health Savings Accounts ("HSA") to assist employees in paying for these costs. A HSA is a tax-free funding account that can be used to pay for medical expenses. If a district makes contributions to a HSA, the money immediately belongs to the employee and will continue to accumulate into retirement. In most plans, a district can contribute a maximum of 100% of the deductible amount every calendar year. Again, assuming a family plan, the District can contribute up to \$3,000 every calendar year into the employee's HSA. If the District is paying 100% of the deductible in a HSA, then an employee on a family plan would, at most, pay an additional \$3,000/calendar year out of pocket before the plan would pay 100% of all costs. The employee can also contribute to his/her HSA up to a combined (district + employee contribution) maximum amount as defined by federal law (currently, that maximum is \$3,500 for single and \$7,000 for 2-person/ family). If an employee does not use all of his/ her HSA funds in one calendar year, that money rolls over and will continue to roll over every year. Any excess funds can also be used in retirement.

What are some common issues with a HDHP? As stated above, the biggest issue will be explaining the plan to employees in a clear and concise manner so as to overcome the stigma attached to HDHPs. Next, in most cases, a district cannot contribute money at the same time to an employee's Health Reimbursement Account ("HRA") and HSA. Third, issues arise around Medicare. If an employee is enrolled in Medicare, a district can no longer contribute to a HSA. However, an employee is not automatically enrolled in Medicare at 65, so reaching that age does not always prohibit HSA contributions. Automatic Medicare enrollment usually happens after an employee begins receiving social security benefits. If an employee is enrolled in Medicare there are ways to continue contributing the deductible amounts via other accounts. Finally, if a spouse must sign up for Medicare or is automatically enrolled after receiving social security, a district can only contribute the amount for a single plan (i.e. \$1,500) into a HSA, but either spouse can use the money. As these plans continue to gain steam, new issues may arise, which can be solved through further education and cooperation between the district and employee.

In sum, the HDHP offers savings to both districts and employees. Less money in premiums, plus district HSA contributions, can lead to increases in salary or other benefits for employees. A HDHP might not be the best plan for your district, but in most cases, it is at least worth having the conversation. Many of the perceived shortcomings can be overcome by educating employees about the plan. Our office can assist in working through this process at the bargaining table to find the best health insurance plans for your district.

LEGISLATURE MAY **CHANGE CIVIL** SERVICE EMPLOYEE DISCIPLINE **PROCEDURES**



This spring, two new bills were introduced into the State Legislature which would have significant changes on the process for terminating or abolishing non-instructional civil service employees. One bill seeks to create a new, more restrictive process for civil service disciplinary hearings. That bill has already passed in the state Senate. The other bill seeks to extend recall rights to labor class and non-competitive class employees. That bill is awaiting signature by Governor Cuomo.

Civil Service Employee Termination Hearings

Bill No. A.7624/S.5205, if enacted, would make the "Section 75" disciplinary hearing process for civil service employees almost as rigorous as the "3020-a" process applicable to teachers and administrators. It has already been passed by the Senate. The Assembly did not have time to pass it before the legislative session ended on June 19, but it will likely be passed when the legislature reconvenes next January. The bill's effects on the disciplinary process would be dramatic.

Section 75 of the Civil Service Law contains the rules for non-instructional employees who have achieved protected status. The first step in the process is writing the disciplinary charges and serving them upon the employee. The charges contain specific examples of the employee's incompetence

or misconduct. Once the charges are served upon the employee, he or she may be placed on unpaid suspension for up to 30 days. Past that point, the employee goes back on regular pay and benefits until the disciplinary process is complete.

If the employee contests the charges, the school district schedules a hearing and the board of education appoints an individual to serve as the hearing officer. The board may select whomever it wishes as the hearing officer, as long as the individual is neutral and unbiased relative to the employee or the charge. School districts typically appoint a third-party attorney or mediator to serve as the hearing officer. The school district is responsible for paying the hearing officer's fee.

At the hearing, both sides may present evidence and call witnesses. After the hearing, the hearing officer makes a recommendation on whether the evidence in the record supports a finding of guilt or innocence on the charge. The hearing officer also recommends a penalty. The board of education may choose to adopt the hearing officer's recommendation, or it may impose a different penalty as long as it is not unlawfully excessive or inconsistent with the evidence. If the employee is found guilty of incompetency or misconduct, there are five permissible penalties the board may impose: a letter of reprimand; a monetary fine up to a maximum of \$100; suspension without pay for a maximum of two months; a demotion in grade or title; or termination.

If passed, bill no. A.7624/S.5205 would impose several critical changes, all of which benefit the employee.

First, the bill would take away a school district's freedom to select the hearing officer. Rather, the bill would require a member of the American Arbitration Association ("AAA") to serve in that position. Additionally, school districts would no longer be able to unilaterally

select the individual. The bill would require selection by "mutual agreement" between the employer and employee. If no agreement is reached, a hearing officer would be selected through default AAA rules. If AAA involvement is required, both sides would be charged administrative fees of several hundred dollars each. The bill also requires all hearing officers to be paid a fee "equivalent to the normal and customary rate" the arbitrator charges for his or her regular AAA arbitration work, which would be the same amount charged to wealthy commercial and private industry clients. In Central New York, those fees can commonly approach or exceed \$1,000 per day, for each day of the hearing.

Second, the bill would require the decision of the hearing officer to be final and binding. Boards of education would lose their right to divert from the hearing officer's recommendations.

Third, the bill would eliminate the 30-day unpaid suspension. Rather, employees would remain on payroll for the duration of the hearing process, without interruption. Curiously, the only exception is if the employee has pled quilty to, or has been convicted of, a felony drug crime. In all other circumstances, the employee receives full pay. This change will likely encourage stalling tactics. Under current Section 75 practices, the 30-day unpaid suspension may be extended by the hearing officer if the employee requests a lengthy delay or adjournment to the hearing. Doing away with unpaid suspension would encourage employees to stall or delay the hearing process as long as possible.

Importantly, there is no provision in the new bill to extend the length of time for civil service employees to qualify for protected status. Whereas teachers are on probation for up to four years before receiving 3020a rights, the bill would grant civil service employees the right to an equally-rigorous termination process after only a few weeks or months, depending on the position.

Several public employee labor unions, including NYSUT, CSEA, and the New York State AFL-CIO have publicly endorsed the bill and have encouraged their membership to petition elected officials in support of the bill.

Preferred Eligible List Employees

The second bill introduced this spring is A.7248/S.5291. This bill affects civil service employees who are excessed or abolished, and greatly expands the range of employees who must be placed on a preferred eligible list ("PEL").

Under current law, only members of the Competitive Class are entitled to be placed on a PEL if their positions are abolished. The new bill would require PEL rights to be expanded to all members of the Noncompetitive Class and Labor Class as well. All other rules and procedures for PELs would remain the same.

This bill has already passed floor votes in the Assembly and Senate, and will be sent to Governor Cuomo for his signature. It will likely become law in the near future.

It is not uncommon for many noncompetitive class and labor class employees to receive PEL rights through their collective bargaining agreements, but not all contracts do. Once the bill is enacted into law, school districts should review their agreements and identify any units where non-competitive or labor class employees do not have contractual PEL rights. Districts should ensure that those employees' service dates are tracked, and that they be added to appropriate PELs if abolishments are necessary.

Long-Term Suspension for Snapchat Posting Upheld by Commissioner of Education

By Jeffrey Mongelli Senior Staff Counsel On Board

The commissioner of education recently rejected various challenges to a long-term suspension that was the result of a student's social media posting that was uploaded off school grounds and during non-school hours.

In Appeal of a Student with a Disability (Decision 17,610, 2019), a high school student and several friends participated in an off-campus paintball game to celebrate the student's birthday. On the day of the party, Sept. 2, 2018, the student took a photo of another district student in front of a rack of mounted paintball guns and added the caption: "Don't come to school on Tuesday." The photograph with caption was uploaded by the student using Snapchat, a social media application.

Later that day, a parent of a district high school student notified the high school principal that their child viewed the posting and found it "disturbing."

A short-term suspension was imposed by the principal, and a long-term suspension hearing was held on Sept. 12, 2018.

The hearing officer recommended that the student be found guilty of the charged conduct and that he be suspended through Sept. 30, 2018. The superintendent adopted the recommendations regarding guilt and penalty.

The board of education denied the petitioners' appeal, and both the short-term and long-term suspensions were appealed to the commissioner of education.

Concerning the short-term suspension, the commissioner found that the principal improperly suspended the student prior to the delivery of the written notice and an opportunity for an informal conference with the principal.

The school district asserted that its procedure was proper because the written notice included a finding that the student's continued presence was a continuing danger to persons or property or an ongoing threat of disruption to the academic process. The commissioner, however, noted that the police investigated the posting and determined that the threat was intended as a joke and that the student did not present a threat to the school district.

In addition, the superintendent had sent a letter to the parents of the district stating that the police department determined that the "threat was made as a joke and posed no danger to our students or staff."

The short-term suspension notice also indicated that the student would "be permitted on school property on Saturday, Sept. 8 to take the ACT exam if he so chooses."

This evidence "belies [the district's] assertion that the student constituted a continuing danger to persons or property or an ongoing threat of disruption to the academic process when the principal imposed the short-term suspension," the commissioner said.

Accordingly, she ordered the school district to annul and expunge from the student's record all references to the short-term suspension.

The commissioner also commented on

the district's apparent practice of using "boilerplate" language in its short-term suspension notices stating that students constitute a continuing danger to persons or property or an ongoing threat of disruption to the academic process. The commissioner indicated that such "boilerplate" language is improper because the determination of whether a student constitutes a continuing danger or ongoing threat of disruption "must be made on a case-by-case basis."

The petitioners also argued that the student could not be disciplined for the posting because the student uploaded the posting outside of school grounds, during nonschool hours. In response, the commissioner noted that students may be disciplined for off-campus conduct that may "endanger the health or safety of pupils within the educational system or adversely affect the educative process."

The commissioner analyzed whether the student's suspension violated the student's rights under the First Amendment since the conduct consisted solely of speech. The commissioner reiterated that a school district may discipline a student for speech where there are facts "that might reasonably have led school officials to forecast substantial disruption or material interference with school activities." This standard applies to off-campus speech where the speech "poses a reasonably foreseeable risk that it would come to the attention of school authorities and materially and substantially disrupt the work and discipline of the school."

The commissioner found that it was "reasonably foreseeable that the student's posting would come to the attention of school officials and that school officials could reasonably foresee that it would cause substantial disruption or material interference with the work and discipline of the school." argument that the student could not be disciplined because, prior to the suspension, the police determined that the posting was intended as a joke and the student was not a threat to the school. The commissioner said:

A threatening posting that triggers an investigation by school authorities and the police, a security sweep of the school, and the issuance of an explanatory message from the superintendent to the community clearly involves a material interference with the operation of the school ... The fact that the threat later proved not to be real and that the student did not intend to carry it out does not preclude discipline of the student for the posting.

The petitioners' challenges to other aspects of the long-term suspension were denied by the commissioner. For instance, the petitioners argued that the charges did not identify the specific portion of the district's code of conduct that the student allegedly violated. The commissioner, however, noted that there is no requirement that a disciplinary notice cite a specific provision of the district's code of conduct. The commissioner found that the language of the charge provided sufficient information for the petitioners and the student to prepare an effective defense.

This article originally appeared in the April 29, 2019 issue of *"On Board,"* the newspaper of the New York State School Boards Association. Reprinted with permission.

The editorial staff of "The Advocate" gratefully acknowledges this contribution.

The commissioner rejected the petitioners'

RECENT AREA TEACHER CONTRACT SETTLEMENTS

	2013- 2014	2014- 2015	2015- 2016	2016- 2017	2017- 2018	2018- 2019	2019- 2020	2020- 2021	2021- 2022	2022- 2023	2023- 2024	AVG.
BOCES	2.25	2.25	2.25	2.50	2.70	2.75	2.80					2.50
Auburn	2.25	2.25	2.60	2.60	2.60	2.70	2.75	2.80	2.85			2.60
Cato-Meridian	2.00	2.00	2.70	2.60	2.50	2.85	2.85					2.50
Jordan-Elbridge	2.18	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.80	2.80	2.80					2.58
Moravia	0.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.90	2.85	2.80					2.29
Port Byron	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.60	2.70	2.60						2.40
Skaneateles	1.50	2.50	2.60	2.75								2.34
So. Cayuga	2.00	2.25	2.25	2.75	2.75	2.75						2.46
Union Springs	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.75	2.80	2.85				2.49
Weedsport	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.75	2.75	2.75					2.46
	1.82	2.23	2.49	2.58	2.69	2.76	2.79	2.83	2.85			
	1								1			
BROOME-TIOG	A BOCES											
Chenango Valley	2.75	2.75	2.75	2.75	2.75	\$2,000	3.00	3.00	3.00			2.84
Deposit	2.50	2.50	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.99						2.83
Maine-Endwell	2.60	2.80	2.95	2.95	2.95	2.95						2.87
Owego-Apal.	2.00	2.00	2.95	2.85	2.75							2.51
Union-Endicott	2.70	2.70	2.60	2.90	2.90	3.50	3.50	3.00	3.00			2.98
Vestal	2.60	2.95	2.95	2.95	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00				2.93
Whitney Point	2.20	2.20	2.50	2.60	2.70							2.44
	2.48	2.56	2.81	2.86	2.86	3.11	3.17	3.00	3.00			
GENESEE VALI	LEY BOCH	ES										
Geneseo	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.75	3.60	3.50					3.12
	1										1	
OSWEGO BOCI	ES											
Hannibal	1.75	2.20	2.20	2.20	2.75	3.00	3.00	3.00				2.51
Oswego	2.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	3.00	3.00	3.00					2.14
-	1.88	2.10	2.10	1.10	2.88	3.00	3.00	3.00				
TOMPKINS-SEN	NECA-TIC	GA BOC	ES									
BOCES												
Candor	2.00	1.5 + \$1000	1.5 + \$1000	2.0 + \$500								1.75
Dryden	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.05					İ	ĺ	ĺ	3.01
Groton	2.50	2.60	2.70	2.70	6.00	6.00	6.0/5.0/4.0			Ì	l	3.75
							% depends					
Ithaca	2.00	2.00	2.00	4.50	\$1,930	3.00	on years					2.70
Lansing	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.25	2.85	2.90	2.65					2.70
Newfield	3.00	3.50	2.75	2.50	3.25	3.00	3.25					3.04
South Seneca	2.45	2.45	1.45	2.30	3.25	3.25	5.25					2.60
Soum Seneca									 			
Trumansburg	3.00	3.00	2.50	3.00	3.25	3.50	3.50		1			3.11

RECENT AREA TEACHER CONTRACT SETTLEMENTS

	2013- 2014	2014- 2015	2015- 2016	2016- 2017	2017- 2018	2018- 2019	2019- 2020	2020- 2021	2021- 2022	2022- 2023	2023- 2024	AVG.
BOCES	2.50	2.45	2.45	3.00	3.00		1	1		1	1	2.68
Bloomfield	1.98	2.00	2.00				1		1			1.99
Canandaigua	2.69	2.65	2.57									2.64
Clyde-Savannah	2.25	2.25	2.25	3.50	3.25	3.25	3.00					2.79
Dundee	2.50	3.00	3.30	3.40	2.50	4.00	3.25	3.25				3.15
Gananda	2.60	2.75	3.00	3.00	3.20							2.91
Geneva	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.50	3.50	2.50						2.75
Gorham- Middlesex	2.50	2.50	2.50	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00					2.79
Honeoye	2.50	2.75	2.75	2.90	3.30	3.30	3.35	3.45				3.04
Lyons	2.50 + \$1,000	2.50 + \$600	2.70 + \$300	2.90 + \$700	2.90 + \$300	2.90 + \$200						2.73
Manchester- Shortsville	2.00	2.00	2.50	3.00	2.50	2.50	2.50					2.43
Marion	2.00	2.40	2.25	3.00	3.25	3.50	3.65					2.86
Naples	2.25	2.25	2.50	2.50	2.60	3.50	3.45	3.35	3.25			2.85
Newark	2.50	2.50	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.25	3.10	3.20				2.73
N Rose-Wolcott	1.90	2.00	2.30	3.50	3.50	3.30	3.30	3.30				2.66
Palmyra-Macedon	3.90	2.50	1.75 + \$500	2.75	2.75	2.75	3.25	3.25	3.25	3.25	3.50	3.12
Penn Yan	1.90	2.00	2.00	2.30	3.00	3.00	3.00					2.46
Phelps-Cl Springs	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00					2.57
Red Creek	2.50	2.40	2.40	4.00	3.25	3.00	2.50					2.86
Romulus	1.50	1.50	5.00	3.00	3.00	3.00						2.83
Seneca Falls	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.75	2.50	2.00						2.38
Sodus	2.00	2.20	3.00	3.00	3.30	3.30		İ		İ	İ	2.80
				6 and 2016- on-step unit	17 3.0 perce members	nt settle-						
Victor	2.50	2.50	3.10	3.10	3.10							2.86
Waterloo	1.50	1.75	1.95	3.00	3.00	3.50	3.50	3.25	3.25			2.74
Wayne	3.00	2.00	3.50	4.00	2.50	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00			3.00
Williamson	2.25	2.50	2.50	2.60	2.50	3.00	3.00	3.75	3.15			2.81
	2.29	2.27	2.70	3.08	2.98	3.08	3.12	3.31	3.18	3.25	3.50	

Denotes Current Contract Denotes Previous Contract

RECENT AREA NON-INSTRUCTIONAL CONTRACT SETTLEMENTS

CAYUGA-ONONDAG	-		0.01 -	0.14	0.15	0010	0010		2021			<u> </u>
	2013- 2014	2014- 2015	2015- 2016	2016- 2017	2017- 2018	2018- 2019	2019- 2020	2020- 2021	2021- 2022	2022- 2023	2023- 2024	Avg.
BOCES												
Aides (CSEA)	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.70	2.75	2.80				2.47
Tchr. Ass't	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.70	2.75						2.41
Non-Instructional	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.70	2.75						2.51
Auburn	1					1	1					
Aides/Clerical (NYSUT)	1.00	2.00	2.00	2.60	2.60	2.60						2.13
Bus Drivers (CSEA)	0.00	2.25	2.25	2.60	2.60	2.60						2.05
Cust/Maint. (CSEA)	0.00	2.25	2.25	2.60	2.60	2.60						2.05
Nurses (SEIU)	2.00											2.00
Cato-Meridian	1	İ	İ	İ	1						1	
Aides/Ass'ts (SEIU)	50¢/hr	50¢/hr	75¢/hr	75¢/hr	75¢/hr	50¢/hr	45¢/hr	45¢/hr				
Bus Drivers (CSEA)	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.25	2.25				2.19
Cust./Maint. (CSEA)	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.25	2.25				2.19
Jordan-Elbridge	1	İ	İ	İ	İ	1	1	İ	ĺ		1	
Aides/Clerical(SEIU)	3.00	3.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.80		İ	Ì		1	2.72
Bus Drivers	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	3.00	3.00	3.00			2.50
Cust./Maint (SEIU)	3.00	3.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.80		İ			İ	2.72
Cafeteria (SEIU)	3.00	3.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.80		İ	Ì		1	2.72
Transportation	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.75	2.75	2.75	3.00	3.00	3.00			2.17
Moravia	1				İ						İ	
Aides/Ass't (CSEA)	0.00	2.00	2.00	2.75	2.75	2.75						2.28
CSEA	0.00	2.00	2.00	2.75	2.75	2.75						2.28
Port Byron	1											
Aides (SEIU)	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50					1	2.33
Cust./Maint. (CSEA)	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50						2.25
Cafeteria (CSEA)	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50						2.25
Nurse (CSEA)	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50						2.25
Clerical (SEIU)	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50						2.33
Skaneateles	1.50	2.50	2.60									
Aides (CSEA)	1.50	2.50	2.60									2.20
Tchr Ass't (CSEA)	1.50	2.50	2.60									2.20
Cust./Maint (CSEA)	1.50	2.50	2.60									2.20
Nurses (CSEA)	1.50	2.50	2.60									2.20
Clerical (CSEA)	1.50	2.50	2.60									2.20
So. Cayuga												
Aides (CSEA)	2.50	2.50	45¢/hr	45¢/hr	45¢/hr	50¢/hr	2.75%	50¢/hr				2.58
Tchr. Ass't (CSEA)	2.50	2.50	45¢/hr	45¢/hr	45¢/hr	50¢/hr	2.75%	50¢/hr				2.58
Bus Drivers (CSEA)	2.50	2.50	45¢/hr	45¢/hr	45¢/hr	50¢/hr	2.75%	50¢/hr				2.58
Bus Mech (CSEA)	2.50	2.50	45¢/hr	45¢/hr	45¢/hr	50¢/hr	2.75%	50¢/hr				2.58
Cust./Maint (CSEA)	2.50	2.50	45¢/hr	45¢/hr	45¢/hr	50¢/hr	2.75%	50¢/hr				2.58
Cafeteria (CSEA)	2.50	2.50	45¢/hr	45¢/hr	45¢/hr	50¢/hr	2.75%	50¢/hr	İ		İ	2.58

RECENT AREA NON-INSTRUCTIONAL CONTRACT SETTLEMENTS

2013- 2014	2014- 2015	2015- 2016	2016- 2017	2017- 2018	2018- 2019	2019- 2020	2020- 2021	2021- 2022	2022- 2023	2023- 2024	Avg.
	1	ĺ	ĺ								
2.50	2.50	45¢/hr	45¢/hr	45¢/hr	50¢/hr	2.75%	50¢/hr				2.58
2.50	2.50	45¢/hr	45¢/hr	45¢/hr	50¢/hr	2.75%	50¢/hr				2.58
2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	*2.50	*2.50	*2.50	*2.50				2.38
2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	*2.50	*2.50	*2.50	*2.50				2.38
2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	3.00	3.00	3.00				2.56
2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	3.00	3.00	3.00				2.56
2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	3.00	3.00	3.00				2.56
2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	3.00	3.00	3.00			İ	2.56
2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	*2.50	*2.50	*2.50	*2.50				2.38
2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	*2.50	*2.50	*2.50	*2.50			İ	2.38
		İ	İ	* @ % +	\$250						
1.95	1.95	2.50	2.50	2,50	2.75	2.75	2.75				2.46
											2.44
1.55	1.55				2.15	2.15	2.15				2.11
1.95	1.95		·		2.75	2.75	2.75				2.46
											2.46
1.90	2.26	2 3/	2 /19	2.54	2 70	2.76	2 77	3.00	2 75		
1.70	2.20	2.07	2.47	2.04	2.70	2.70	2.11	5.00	2.15	1	<u> </u>
CES											
2.25	2.50	2.90	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00					2.81
											<u> </u>
2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	\$1/hr	4.00	50¢/hr			3.00
											
2.00	50¢/br	50 d/hr	50¢/br								2.00
2.00	50¢/111	50¢/11	50¢/11								2.00
2.05	2.00	2.15									3.03
											5.05
\$000	\$700	\$800				ļ					<u> </u>
1.99	1.99	2.50	2.50	2.50	l	·					2.30
	1										
2 70	2 70	2.70	2.70	3.40	*3.00	*3.00	3.00	3.00			2.89
											2.89
				5.40							2.91
2.10			2.70	3.40	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00			2.91
2 70	2 70						5.00				1 4.11
2.70	2.70	2.70									
2.70 2.70 2.70	2.70 2.70 2.70	2.70 2.70 2.70	2.70 2.70 2.70	3.40 3.40 3.40	5.00 3.00	3.00 *3.00	2.00 *3.00	2.00			2.91 2.87
	A BOCES 2013- 2014 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.00 2.	A BOCES cont'd 2013- 2014 2014- 2015 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.00 2.50 2.00 2.50 2.00 2.50 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.50 1.95 1.95 1.95 1.95 1.95 1.95 1.95 1.95 1.95 1.95 1.95 1.95 1.95 1.95 1.95 2.50 2.00 3.00 2.00 3.00 2.00 3.00 2.00 \$0\$ 2.00 \$0\$ 2.00 \$0\$ 2.00 \$0\$ \$1.99	A BOCES cont'd 2013- 2014 2014- 2015 2015- 2016 2.50 2.50 45¢/hr 2.50 2.50 45¢/hr 2.50 2.50 45¢/hr 2.00 2.50 2.50 2.00 2.50 2.50 2.00 2.50 2.50 2.00 2.00 2.50 2.00 2.00 2.50 2.00 2.00 2.50 2.00 2.00 2.50 2.00 2.00 2.50 2.00 2.50 2.50 2.00 2.50 2.50 2.00 2.50 2.50 1.95 1.95 2.50 1.95 1.95 2.50 1.95 1.95 2.50 1.95 1.95 2.50 1.95 2.50 2.90 1.90 2.26 2.90 1.90 2.50 2.90 2.00 3.00 3.00 2.00 3.00 3.00 2.00 50¢/hr 50¢/	A BOCES cont'd2013- 20142015- 20162016- 2017201420152016- 20172.502.5045¢/hr45¢/hr2.502.5045¢/hr45¢/hr2.502.502.502.502.002.502.502.502.002.002.502.502.002.002.502.502.002.002.502.502.002.002.502.502.002.002.502.502.002.002.502.502.002.502.502.502.002.502.502.502.002.502.502.502.002.502.502.501.951.952.502.501.951.952.502.501.951.952.502.501.951.952.502.501.951.952.502.501.951.952.502.501.951.952.503.001.952.502.503.002.003.003.003.002.003.003.003.002.0050¢/hr50¢/hr50¢/hr2.0050¢/hr50¢/hr50¢/hr2.0050¢/hr50¢/hr50¢/hr2.003.003.1511.991.992.502.502.702.702.702.70	ABOCES cont'd 2013- 2013 2014- 2015 2016- 2017 2017- 2018 2014 2015 2016- 2017 2018 2017- 2018 2.50 2.50 45¢/hr 45¢/hr 45¢/hr 2.50 2.50 45¢/hr 45¢/hr 45¢/hr 2.50 2.50 45¢/hr 45¢/hr 45¢/hr 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.00 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.00 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.00 2.00 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.00 2.00 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.00 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.00 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.00 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.00 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.50 1.95 1.95 2.50 2.50 2.50 1.95 2.5	ABOCES cont'd 2013- 2014 2015- 2015 2015- 2017 2017- 2018 2017- 2019 2017- 2019 2017- 2010 2017- 2010 2017- 2010 2010 2017- 2010 2010 2017- 2010 2010 2017- 2010 2010	ABOCES cont'd 2013- 2014 2015- 2015 2017- 2017 2018- 2018 2019- 2019 2019- 2019 2014 2015- 201 2015- 201 2017- 201 2018- 2018 2019- 2018 2019- 2019 2019- 2019 2019- 2019 2019- 2019 2019- 2019 2019- 2019 2014- 2019 2014- 2019 2014- 2019 2014- 2019 2014- 2019 2019- 2019 2019- 2019 2019- 2019 2019- 2010 2010- 2010	ABOCES vortiding to the section of the	ABOCES cont'd 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020 2021 2014 2016 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020 2021 2010 2014 2016 2016 2016 2021 2021 2010 2.50 45¢/hr 45¢/hr 45¢/hr 50¢/hr 2.75% 50¢/hr 1 2.00 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.50 3.00 3.00 3.00 2.00 2.50 2.50 2.50 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 2.00 2.50 2.50 2.50 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 2.00 2.00 2.50 2.50 2.50 3.00 3.00 3.00 2.00 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.50 </td <td>2013- 20142015-2016-2017-2018-2019-2020-2021-2022-2022-11</td> <td>A BOCES out'd201620162017201820192020202120222023202320142015201620182018201920202021202320232023201520162016201820192020202020212023203</td>	2013- 20142015-2016-2017-2018-2019-2020-2021-2022-2022-11	A BOCES out'd201620162017201820192020202120222023202320142015201620182018201920202021202320232023201520162016201820192020202020212023203

	RECI	ENT ARI	EA NON	-INSTRU	UCTION	L CON	FRACT	SETTLI	EMENT	S		
	2013- 2014	2014- 2015	2015- 2016	2016- 2017	2 0 1 7 - 2018	2018- 2019	2019- 2020	2020- 2021	2021- 2022	2022- 2023	2023- 2024	Avg.
BROOME-TIOGA H	BOCES con	ıt'd							,			
Vestal												
Paraprofessional					3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00				3.00
Employees				2.90	2.95	3.00						2.95
Whitney Point												
Aides/Food Serv	2.25	2.50	2.50	2.50								2.44
(NYSUT)	2.25	2.50	2.50	2.50								2.11
B-T BOCES Avg	2.49	2.66	2.75	2.73	3.19	3.20	3.00	3.00	2.80			
OSWEGO BOCES												
Hannibal												
CSEA	1.75	1.95	2.00	2.50	2.75	3.00						2.33
HEA	1.75	2.20	2.20	2.20	2.25							2.12
Oswego												
CSEA	2.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00				2.25
Osw. BOCES Avg.	1.83	2.05	2.07	1.57	2.67	3.00	3.00	3.00				
TOMPKINS-SENEO		POCES										
BOCES	A-HOGA	BUCES	I									
Local												
Local												
Candor												
Local	1											
Dryden											ĺ	
NYSUT	3.00	2.85	2.66	2.90	3.75	3.50	3.50				1	3.17
Groton												
CSEA	2.50	2.75	2.75	2.25	2.25	2.25						2.46
Ithaca												
Supp Prof.		2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00							2.25
. .												
Lansing	00.4/1	2.50	60 + 11	2.00								2.05
NYSUT	90¢/hr	3.50	60¢/hr	3.00								3.25
Newfield												
CSEA	2.50	1.50	2.25	2.25	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00				2.56
South Seneca												
Local	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.60	2.10	2.00	\$1.40-	3.50	2.50	2.50		2.36
		,	,				2.00/hr					
Trumansburg	0.50	0.50	0.50			0.70						
Local	2.50	2.50	2.50	50¢/hr	56¢/hr	3.50						2.75
T-S-T Avg.	2.50	2.44	2.53	2.50	2.62	2.85	3.25	3.00				

	REC	ENT AR	EA NON	-INSTR	UCTION	AL CON	TRACT	SETTL	EMENT	S		
	2013- 2014	2014- 2015	2015- 2016	2016- 2017	2017- 2018	2018- 2019	2019- 2020	2020- 2021	2021- 2022	2022- 2023	2023- 2024	Avg.
WAYNE-FINGER L	AKES BO	DCES										
BOCES												
NYSUT	1.90	2.75	2.45	2.45								2.39
Bloomfield		İ	İ			İ						
NEA/NYSUT	1.95	1.85	1.85									1.88
C 1:												
Canandaigua Cust./Maint.	2.00	3.00	3.00									2.00
Cler./Aides	3.00 3.00	2.40	2.40									3.00 2.60
Food Service	2.25	2.40	3.00	3.00	3.00							2.00
Bus Drivers	2.25	2.25	3.00	3.00	3.00					l	l	2.25
Monitors	2.25	2.23	3.47	2.40	2.35							2.23
Wolintois	2.23	2.00	3.47	2.40	2.33							2.49
Clyde-Savannah	İ					Ì						
Supp Pers (CSEA)	2.50	2.50	2.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50					3.07
Transp.	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.75	3.60	3.50	3.50					2.91
Dundee												
CSEA	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50						2.25
Gananda												
CSEA	2.80	2.80	2.80									2.80
COLA	2.00	2.00	2.00									2.00
Geneva						*for 5+ yı	s of service u	ip to \$1.00				
CSEA	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	*5¢/hr/yrs	+ 75¢/hr	+75¢/hr				2.60
Gorham-Middlesex												
Bus Drivers (NYSUT)	2.25	2.25	2.70	2.70	2.70							2.52
Cust./F Serv (NYSUT)	3.75	2.70	2.70	2.50	50¢/hr	50¢/hr	3.00	3.00				2.94
Teacher Aides (NYSUT)	2.25	2.70	2.70	2.50	50¢/hr	50¢/hr	3.00	3.00				2.69
Honeoye	0.50	0.75	0.50	2.00	2.05	2.05	2.50	2.25	2.20	2.20		2.01
NYSUT	2.50	2.75	2.50	3.00	2.95	2.95	3.50	3.35	3.30	3.30		3.01
Lyons												
NYSUT	2.50	2.50	2.50	1.80	1.80	1.80	2.90	2.90	2.90			2.40
				+ 54¢/hr	+ 54¢/hr	+ 54¢/hr	+70¢/hr	+70¢/hr	+70¢/hr			
Manchester-S'ville												
CSEA	1.90	1.90	2.50	2.50	2.50							2.26
COLA	1.90	1.90	2.50	2.50	2.50							2.20
Marion												
CSEA	1.75	1.75	1.75			1						1.75
						1						
Naples												
CSEA	2.70	2.70	2.70	2.80	2.90	2.90						2.78

RECENT AREA NON-INSTRUCTIONAL CONTRACT SETTLEMENTS

WAYNE-FINGER	1				·		v	·				
	2013- 2014	2014- 2015	2015- 2016	2016- 2017	2017- 2018	2018- 2019	2019- 2020	2020- 2021	2021- 2022	2022- 2023	2023- 2024	Avg.
Newark					*or startin	ng rate +1.2%	if greater					
Custodians (CSEA)	2.00	2.00	2.40	2.00	* 50¢/hr	2.90	2.90			1	1	2.37
Tchr Aides/Asst (NYSUT)	1.50	2.40	2.00	*2.25	*2.25	1.50						1.98
				* 201	6-17 & 201 3.0% base	7-18 2.25- ed on years						
N Rose-Wolcott												
NYSUT	1.90	1.90	1.95									1.53
Palmyra-Macedon												
CSEA	2.90	2.90	2.90	2.90	\$2,400/ salary	\$2,500/ salary	\$2,500/ salary	\$2,500/ salary				2.90
				or	\$1.15/hr	\$1.20/hr	\$1.20/hr	\$1.20/hr				
Penn Yan												
CSEA	2.25	2.25	2.25	2.35	2.35							2.29
Phelps-Cl Springs (NYSUT)												
Nurses/Food Serv/ Bus Driv/Maint	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00					2.57
Aides/Clerical	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00					2.57
Red Creek												
CSEA	2.00	2.00	* 3.50	2.50	2.50							2.25
			* 2015-16	% based o	on hire date	1						
Romulus												
CSEA	1.50	1.50	3.00	3.00	3.00							2.40
Seneca Falls												
NEA/NYSUT	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.75	2.50	2.00						2.38
Sodus												
CSEA	2.00	2.00	2.00				<u> </u>					2.00
Victor												
CSEA	1.50	2.00	2.00	2.00								1.88
Waterloo												
NEA/NYSUT	1.50	1.75	1.95	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00			2.58
Wayne												
CSEA	2.50	2.70	2.90	2.90	2.70	2.90	5.00	4.25	4.00	4.00		3.39
Williamson						OR	\$1.00/hr					
CSEA	3.00	2.00	1.75	2.00	3.50	3.25	3.00	3.00				2.69
WFL BOCES Avg.	2.27	2.28	2.44	2.73	2.83	2.82	3.21	3.21	3.30	3.65	1	1

AREA UNEMPLOYMENT RATES

New York State Rate

Year	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Ann. Avg.
2019	4.6%	4.4%	4.1%	3.6%									
2018	5.0%	5.1%	4.6%	4.0%	3.7%	4.1%	4.2%	4.0%	3.6%	3.6%	3.5%	3.9%	4.1%

Syracuse, NY Metropolitan Statistical Area

Year	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Ann. Avg.
2019	4.7%	4.6%	4.4%	3.7%									
2018	5.8%	5.8%	5.1%	4.4%	3.9%	4.3%	4.2%	3.8%	3.6%	3.5%	3.6%	4.2%	4.3%

Cayuga County Statistical Area

Year	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Ann. Avg.
2019	5.1%	5.0%	4.8%	3.9%									
2018	6.1%	6.0%	5.5%	4.7%	4.0%	4.2%	4.3%	4.1%	3.5%	3.5%	3.6%	4.3%	4.5%

Broome County Statistical Area

Year	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	Мау	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Ann. Avg.
2019	5.4%	5.1%	4.9%	4.1%									
2018	6.6%	6.6%	5.8%	5.0%	4.3%	4.8%	4.8%	4.5%	4.0%	3.9%	3.9%	4.5%	4.9%

Ithaca, NY Metropolitan Statistical Area

Year	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	Мау	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Ann. Avg.
2019	3.7%	3.6%	3.4%	3.0%									
2018	4.7%	4.7%	3.9%	4.0%	3.7%	5.1%	4.9%	4.4%	3.9%	3.6%	3.4%	3.2%	4.1%

Ontario/Seneca/Wayne/Yates Statistical Area

Year	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	Мау	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Ann. Avg.
2019	4.5%	4.5%	4.3%	3.5%									
2018	5.5%	5.7%	5.0%	4.2%	3.5%	3.8%	3.5%	3.4%	3.2%	3.1%	3.2%	3.9%	4.0%

Rochester, NY Metropolitan Statistical Area

Year	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Ann. Avg.
2019	4.5%	4.4%	4.2%	3.6%									
2018	5.4%	5.5%	4.9%	4.3%	3.9%	4.2%	4.1%	4.0%	3.6%	3.5%	3.5%	4.0%	4.2%

* *Please note that 2018 data has been updated as labor force statistics for all LAUS areas are revised each year as part of the benchmarking process. The annual benchmarking process is part of the nationwide reestimating procedure mandated by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Source: New York State Department of Labor Statistics

www.labor.state.ny.us

CONSUMER PRICE INDICES

	INDEX 1982-84 BASE YEAR=100	% INCREASE FROM PRIOR MONTH	% INCREASE FROM PRIOR YEAR
	April 2019		
NY-Northeastern New Jersey Are	ea		
1. All Urban Consumers	277.441	0.3	1.6
2. Urban Wage Earners & Clerical Workers	271.992	0.3	1.5
U.S. City Average			
 All Urban Consumers Urban Wage Earners 	255.548	0.5	2.0
& Clerical Workers	249.332	0.6	1.9
	May 2019		
NY-Northeastern New Jersey Are	ea		
 All Urban Consumers Urban Wage Earners 	278.068	0.2	1.5
& Clerical Workers	272.726	0.3	1.4
U.S. City Average			
 All Urban Consumers Urban Wage Earners 	256.092	0.2	1.8
& Clerical Workers	249.871	0.2	1.7

COST OF LIVING UPDATE

ALL CITIES

NY - NORTHEASTERN NEW JERSEY

Month	Revised Wage Earner Index	%	All Urban Consumers Index	%	Revised Wage Earner Index	%	All Urban Consumers Index	%
Jan-17	236.9	2.5	242.8	2.5	261.4	2.5	266.9	2.5
Feb-17	237.5	2.8	243.6	2.7	262.1	2.7	267.7	2.6
Mar-17	237.7	2.3	243.8	2.4	262.2	2.4	267.6	2.3
Apr-17	238.4	2.1	244.5	2.2	262.5	2.0	267.9	2.0
May-17	238.6	1.8	244.7	1.9	262.8	2.0	268.2	1.8
Jun-17	238.8	1.5	244.9	1.6	263.2	1.9	268.7	1.8
Jul-17	238.6	1.6	244.8	1.7	262.6	1.7	268.1	1.6
Aug-17	239.4	1.9	245.5	1.9	263.5	2.0	268.7	1.7
Sep-17	240.9	2.3	246.8	2.2	265.3	2.4	270.1	2.1
Oct-17	240.6	2.1	246.7	2.0	264.6	2.2	269.6	1.8
Nov-17	240.7	2.3	246.7	2.2	264.2	1.9	269.4	1.6
Dec-17	240.5	2.2	246.5	2.1	264.4	1.8	269.6	1.4
Jan-18	241.9	2.1	247.9	2.1	265.7	1.6	270.8	1.4
Feb-18	243.0	2.3	249.0	2.2	267.2	1.9	272.2	1.7
Mar-18	243.5	2.4	249.6	2.4	267.1	1.9	272.2	1.7
Apr-18	244.6	2.6	250.5	2.5	267.9	2.1	273.0	1.9
May-18	245.8	3.0	251.6	2.8	269.0	2.3	274.0	2.2
Jun-18	246.2	3.1	252.0	2.9	269.3	2.3	274.2	2.0
Jul-18	246.2	3.2	252.0	2.9	269.1	2.5	274.1	2.2
Aug-18	246.3	2.9	252.1	2.7	269.3	2.2	274.4	2.2
Sep-18	246.6	2.3	252.4	2.3	270.3	1.9	275.5	2.0
Oct-18	247.0	2.7	252.9	2.5	269.9	2.0	275.1	2.0
Nov-18	245.9	2.2	252.0	2.2	269.2	1.9	274.5	1.9
Dec-18	244.8	1.8	251.2	1.9	268.4	1.5	273.8	1.6
Jan-19	245.1	1.3	251.7	1.6	269.7	1.5	275.1	1.6
Feb-19	246.2	1.3	252.8	1.5	270.3	1.2	275.8	1.3
Mar-19	247.8	1.8	254.2	1.9	271.1	1.5	276.6	1.6
Apr-19	249.3	1.9	255.5	2.0	272.0	1.5	277.4	1.6
May-19	249.9	1.7	256.1	1.8	272.7	1.4	278.1	1.5

THE ADVOCATE STAFF

Editorial Assistant & Desktop Publisher: Kelly M. Walsh

Contributors:

Randy J. Ray • J. Ryan Hatch • Nicholas Minderler • Bryan Georgiady

Published by:

Cayuga-Onondaga BOCES Office of Personnel Relations 1879 West Genesee Street Road Auburn, NY 13021-9430 <u>Telephone</u>: 315-255-7683 • <u>Fax</u>: 315-255-7625

* All Rights Reserved

PAST ISSUES OF "THE ADVOCATE"

Past issues of "The Advocate" can be read and/or downloaded for your reference at your convenience.

Simply go to our website at <u>www.cayboces.org</u>, navigate through Management Services, then Labor Relations Service, then click the link to "The Advocate" newsletter.

NOTICE OF NON-DISCRIMINATION

The Cayuga–Onondaga BOCES does not discriminate on the basis of an individual's actual or perceived race, color, religion, creed, ethnicity, national origin, citizenship status, age, marital status, partnership status, disability, predisposing genetic characteristics, sexual orientation, gender/sex, military status, veteran status, domestic violence victim status or political affiliation, and additionally does not discriminate against students on the basis of weight, gender identity, gender expression, and religious practices or any other basis prohibited by New York state and/or federal non–discrimination laws in employment or its programs and activities. The BOCES provides equal access to community and youth organizations.

Inquiries regarding the District's non-discrimination policies should be directed to:

J. Ryan Hatch Labor Relations Specialist and Civil Rights Compliance Officer 1879 West Genesee Street Road Auburn, NY 13021 (315) 255-7683 rhatch@cayboces.org